SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT.—

A.—30. (*a*) The Committee have not yet submitted their report.

(*b*) Seven meetings including one sub-committee meeting.

(*c*) Government consider it unnecessary to send a reminder.

(*d*) The question is premature, as Government have not yet come to any decision in the matter.

Supplementary Question and Answer.

Mr. Narayana Iyengar.—

When can the report be expected ?

Legal Remembrancer.—

It may come in about 2 weeks.

MESSRS. A. NARAYANA IYENGAR (Hassan Taluk) and CHENNABASAPPA (Arsikere Taluk).—

Q.—31. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Whether it is true that the Government have passed orders to the effect that no Bench Magistrates' Courts will try cases in which either party is a Government servant?

(*b*) If so, what is the reason to pass such an order ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT.—

A.—31. (*a*) The attention of the member is invited to the proviso to Rule 1 of the rules issued with Notification No. P. 322—Cts. 308 of 26-7, dated 14/16-7-1928, under which a Bench Court may try such cases only with the permission of the District Magistrate. (*Vide* Appendix VIII.)

(*b*) The rule is based on the analogy of rules existing in certain British Indian Provinces and is considered suitable.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. Narayana Iyengar —

When a Bench Magistrate can try any respectable private person why should a peon not be tried by it ?

Third Member of Council.—

The idea is that a Bench may not be influenced owing to a Government servant being a party. It is not intended to protect the Government servant.

Mr. Satyanaraya Setty.—

If an exception is made like this, would it not amount to a discourtesy shown to the Bench Court ?

Third Member of Council.—

I do not think so.

Mr. H. B. Gundappa.—

Are there any instances of this kind that have come to the notice of Government ?

Third Member of Council.—

No. These rules are based on rules in force in parts of British India.

REPRESENTATIONS.

At this stage a discussion was raised by MR. S. C. MALLIAH that Representation No. 59 was not passed by the District Meeting, that the Deputy Commissioner had no power to include any subject that was not passed at the District Meeting. In his opinion the rule on the point was clear.

MR. MAHAMAD SAIT also gave expression to the same opinion and said that a definite ruling in regard to the action of the Deputy Commissioner was called for.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO observed that this question was not discussed in the Rules Committee but that as the existing rule gave room to a number of members to join together and defeat any subjects being brought up from any particular constituency, the better arrangement would be to select subjects by ballot. So far as the matter before the House was concerned he said that the majority of subjects were proposed by a large majority of members signing their names under each and that except No. 2 the rest were all accepted.

MESSRS. H. C. DASAPPA and MALLAPPA said that the only point was whether the Deputy Commissioner had power to include subjects not passed at the meeting.